

10400 Eaton Place
Suite 312
FAIRFAX, VA
Phone: (703) 385-5200
Fax: (703) 385-5080

KEATING & BENNETT LLP**Fax****FAXED****OFFICIAL****RECEIVED
GENERAL FAX CENTER****NOV 9 2003****To:** Examiner Dougherty**From:** Christopher A. Bennett

Art Unit 2834

Fax: 703-872-9319**Date:** November 7, 2003

703-872-9306

Phone:**Pages:** 8**Re:** 09/811,660**CC:****•Comments:**

Dear Examiner Trinh,

After inquiring with the Group Receptionist regarding the above-identified application, it has come to our attention that the Request for Reconsideration that we faxed on August 11, 2003 has not been entered.

Accordingly, we enclosed hereto, a copy of the Request for Reconsideration as well as a copy of the Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission we received on August 11, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher A. Bennett

For

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
(Reg. No. 46,710)

11/07/2003 15:25 7033855080

KEATING & BENNETT

PAGE 02/08

08/11/03 18:19:30

USPTO->

7033855080 RightP/

Page 001

TO:Auto-reply fax to 7033855080 COMPANY:

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

TO:

Fax Sender at 7033855080

Fax Information

Date Received:

Total Pages:

8/11/03 4:58:01 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

7 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page

=====>

08/11/2003 16:00	7033855080	KEATING & BENNETT	PAGE 01/07
------------------	------------	-------------------	------------

UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

KEATING & BENNETT LLP

Fax

To: Examiner Dougherty	From: Joseph R. Keating
Fax: 703-872-9519	Date: August 11, 2003
Phone: 703-306-1628	Pages: 7
Re: 09/811,860	cc:
38860.447	

Comments:

Examiner Dougherty

Please find attached hereto the following documents for the above-identified application:

Request for Reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph R. Keating
for
Keating & Bennett, LLP
(Registration Number 37,386)

Received from < 7033855080 > at 11/7/03 3:22:50 PM [Eastern Standard Time]

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to
Group Art Unit 2834, 703-872-9319, addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450.

Date: August 11, 2003


Sonia V. McVean

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2834**

PATENT
36856.447

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Akiteru TAKATSUKA et al.	Art Unit: 2834
Serial No.: 09/811,660	Examiner: T. Dougherty
Filed: March 19, 2001	
Title: METHOD FOR SELECTING PIEZOELECTRIC TRANSFORMER CHARACTERISTIC	

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 07 2003
OFFICIAL

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 15, 2003, please reconsider the above identified application in view of the following remarks.

On May 1, 2003, Applicants' counsel conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner. Applicants' counsel pointed out errors in the Office Action issued on April 22, 2003. The Examiner agreed and issued an Office Action on May 15, 2003. The present Request for Reconsideration is in response to the outstanding Office Action dated May 15, 2003.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 5,424,602) in view of Lejeune (US 6,269,326). Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 5,424,602) and Lejeune (US 6,269,326) in view of Onishi et al. (JP 2000-216450). Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected